



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/683,650	01/29/2002	Chien-Chung Li	IHSP0001USA	6292
27765	7590	09/12/2005	EXAMINER	
NORTH AMERICA INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY CORPORATION P.O. BOX 506 MERRIFIELD, VA 22116			PITARO, RYAN F	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2174	

DATE MAILED: 09/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/683,650

Applicant(s)

LI ET AL.

Examiner

Ryan F. Pitaro

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 June 2005.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 10, 12-21 and 23-30 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-8, 10, 12-21, 23-30 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-32 have been examined.

Response to Amendment

2. This action is responsive to the communication filed 6/21/2005. Claims 1-8,10,12-21,23-30 are pending in this application and have been amended. Claims 9,11,22,31-32 have been canceled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1,3-8,10,13,15-21,23 and 25-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Douglas ("Douglas", Relatives Genealogical Software) in view of Bowers et al ("Bowers", US 5,546,529).

As per independent claim 1, Douglas discloses an interface system for a computer, the computer comprising a monitor and a processor, the system comprising: a plurality of target data sets, each target data set comprising an ID of a target (Figure 2 item 5,10); at least a relation data set, each relation data set comprising IDs of two targets and a relation attribute data of the two targets (Figure 2 item 15); a display program for displaying the plurality of target data sets and the relation data sets on the

Art Unit: 2174

monitor in a relation graph format (Figure 2), each target data set displayed as an icon in the relation graph, and each relation data set displayed in a linking graph format between the two icons corresponding to the two targets of the relation data set (Figure 2 items 5,10); a selection program for a user to select the icons displayed on the monitor (Page 1 lines 17-21); and an application program activated by the user to provide a predetermined functionality to the IDs of the icons selected by using the selection program (Page 2 lines 3-5). Douglas fails to distinctly point out selecting a plurality of icons and show which icons are chosen. However, Bowers teaches selection program for a user to select a plurality of the icons displayed on the monitor and to show on the monitor, in a specific manner, the plurality of chosen icons such that the user is capable of recognizing the plurality of chosen icons (Column 10 lines 29-39, Figure 13).

Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the teaching of Bowers with the system of Douglas. Motivation to do so would have been to notify the users of which files are selected.

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Douglas discloses the interface wherein the relation data set further comprises a relation attribute classification data for determining classification of the relation attribute data of the relation data set ((Figure 2 item 15).

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 3, Douglas discloses the interface wherein the relation attribute classification data is a personal relationship or a business relationship (Page 2 lines 27-30; *mother and father are personal relationships*).

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 1, Douglas discloses the interface wherein the relation data set further comprises a relation state data for representing an existence state or an existence time of the relation attribute data of the relation data set (Page 2 lines 27-30; *Birth and death included as an existence state*).

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 1, Douglas discloses the interface wherein the relation data set further comprises a relation sort data for representing sorting parameters of each target having a same relation attribute data with a specific target (Page 8 Father Pop-down list and Mother Pop down list).

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 1, Douglas discloses the interface wherein each target data set further comprises a classification data for representing a classification of a target in the target data set (Page 4 Male and Female).

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 7, Douglas discloses the interface wherein the classification data is a group or an individual for representing a target of the target data set as a group or an individual (Page 4 Male and Female).

As per claim 10, which is dependent on claim 1, Douglas discloses the interface wherein the selection program is used to show on the monitor relations between each icon of the plurality of icons chosen by the user (Figure 1).

Claims 13 and 23 are individually similar in scope to that of claim 1 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 15 and 25 are individually similar in scope to that of claim 3 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 16 and 26 are individually similar in scope to that of claim 4 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 17 and 27 are individually similar in scope to that of claim 5 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 18 and 28 are individually similar in scope to that of claim 6 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 19 and 29 are individually similar in scope to that of claim 7 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 20 and 30 are individually similar in scope to that of claim 8 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 21 is similar in scope to that of claim 10 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

3. Claim 2, 14, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Douglas ("Douglas", Relatives Genealogical Software) and Bowers et al ("Bowers", US 5,546,529) in view of Bazerman et al ("Bazerman", US 6,859,253)

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Douglas-Bowers fails to distinctly point out different relationships being represented by different links. However, Bazerman teaches an interface wherein if the relation attribute data of two relation data sets are different, the display program uses two different link graphs to represent the

two different kinds of relation attributes (Column 6 lines 20-34; Figure 4). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine Douglas-Bowers with the teaching of Bazerman. Motivation to do so would have been to easily determine the relationships of the links by visually displaying each relationship differently.

Claims 14 and 24 are individually similar in scope to that of claim 2 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

4. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Douglas ("Douglas", Relatives Genealogical Software) and Bowers et al ("Bowers", US 5,546,529) in view of Pollock ("Pollock", The E-mail Link).

As per claim 12, which is dependent on claim 1, Douglas-Bowers fails to distinctly point out an each target includes an email address and opening an email application upon selection of the address. However, Pollock teaches an e-mail address of a target (Pages lines 1-4), and an application program as an email program so that the user is capable of sending e-mail to e-mail addresses of each icon chosen by the selection program (Page 7 lines 11-12). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the interface of Douglas-Bowers with the teaching of Pollock. Motivation to do so would have been to provide link information so that users may easily contact other family members.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-8,10,12-21,23-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ryan F Pitaro whose telephone number is 571-272-

Art Unit: 2174

4071. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00am - 4:30pm Monday through Thursday and on alternating Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on 571-272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ryan Pitaro
Art Unit 2174
Patent Examiner

RFP

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100